

**Karner Blue HCP  
Monitoring Improvement Team  
February 15, 2006  
Portage County Annex, Stevens Point**

**Minutes**

Attending: Bob Hess, Joel Aanensen, Paul Kooiker, Paul Rasmussen, Scott Swengel, Cathy Carnes, Matt Krumenauer, Joe Henry, Dave Lentz and Crystal Fankhauser

1) Dave gave the anti-trust statement.

2) Dave reviewed the agenda.

**3) Review the proposed approach to the HCP renewal and 5-point plan.**

Point one: Focus HCP implementation on recovery areas was discussed at length.

- Dave started by going over the 5-point plan. Cathy suggested creating a list of things that would change once recovery began.
- The Karner blue recovery areas map which showed DNR recovery properties was brought up. Cathy suggested that it would be useful to include all recovery areas, i.e. Quincy Bluff (TNC), Necedah NWR & WMA, Fort McCoy, Hardwood Bombing Range, and Bob Welch's property.

Added note: Replace DNR property project boundaries with actual DNR property boundaries; color code ownership categories by state, federal and private.

- Dave stated his opinion that the high potential range may no longer be pertinent because only three Karner sightings have been made outside the documented range, and they were very close to the edge of the range.

**Action:** Crystal to confirm and locate documented range outliers on next generation of map. Added note: Also create a version which includes KBB EOs.

- Cathy suggested that in order to discontinue using the high potential range, it would be useful to look at all of the partner data between the documented range and the high potential range to reflect KBB absence and presence in this buffer zone; and to also consider Ted Sickley's lupine probability model in order to demonstrate that there is a low probability of finding Karners outside of the documented range in the buffer zone.

**Action:** Crystal to work on mapping evidence for the objective above.

- Scott spoke about his and Ann's research on distance between populations vs. the degree of covariance in their pop. Fluctuations. Their analysis suggested that Karner blue populations behave like metapopulations. Population synchrony is much greater between sites less than 2 miles away from each other than for distances greater than this. This suggests that Karner movements or local dynamics greatly affect populations within this radius but that environmental effects are more important beyond 2 miles. Northwestern WI populations don't fluctuate in synchrony with central WI populations.
- Cathy reference Jim Dunn's dispersal study that showed Karner disperse greater distance through forest cover than previously believed.

**Action:** Cathy will send actual study to Dave for distribution to partners.

- Take home message: Shift our concentration of activities and resources to areas where Karners occur and where recovery will take place in perpetuity.

**Action:** Dave to send Ted Sickley's lupine modeling report to MIT members.

**4) Revisit MIT's "monitoring objectives" exercise from 2004-05 when we originally organized the MIT, and then consider the current ITP renewal plan being proposed to see how (or where) these objectives may change in the proposed renewal approach.**

Dave spoke about shifting the focus of monitoring to demonstrating recovery. This was not previously a part of the monitoring objectives.

Major objectives of management (to base monitoring on):

1) Avoid or minimize negative impacts to Karners

- Need to know where Karners are.
- Joel suggested focusing this objective in SPAs and ACEs, not everywhere in documented range, especially since land management activities that have supported Karners in the past have not changed much with the implementation of the HCP.
- Dave suggested that partners outside SPAs and ACEs only do pre-management lupine surveys to identify areas to possibly avoid. This is what most limited partners do.
- Paul K. expressed concerns about the affects of this objective when it is focused on recovery properties, because Crex does not manage solely for Karners, but for a variety of barrens species. Would the new focus on recovery properties further restrict his land management activities?
- Cathy stated that she thought Crex's management activities were fulfilling this objective.
- Joel recommended changing the objective to "avoid or minimize long-term negative impacts to Karners".

2) Manage timber harvests to support KBB populations (shifting mosaic).

*Post note (Dave): This has been circumstantial or voluntary and not required for all known populations. In the proposed approach, this would not be any different.*

*However, the proposed approach will offer greater incentive to voluntarily support a recovery population with a SM strategy within recovery areas.*

3) Manage POH sites including conservation lands and roadside corridors to reset succession on occupied sites with a certain rotational period. This will not change, only that more emphasis will be placed within recovery areas.

4) Restore Karner habitat on POH sites near existing Karner populations.

- What is more important to the continued existence of KBB than regulatory compliance is continued beneficial and critical disturbance management. Dave proposed a shift in emphasis from regulatory reporting to monitoring management activities via implementation monitoring (audits) and applying adaptive management and one-on-one conservation training based on process results.
- Scott stated the importance of abundance monitoring (Level 3) in recovery areas to show that populations are stable.

- Paul R. discussed the utility of maintaining permanent transects on recovery properties.
- Paul K. agreed and said that all along this was what he expected would happen on recovery properties.
- Take home message: As the partnership shifts towards support of recovery, monitoring will shift towards more intensive monitoring (abundance monitoring) to aid recovery within recovery properties, and toward light surveying (lupine surveys) outside recovery properties and within the documented range, and little to no monitoring outside the documenting range.
- In order to begin a shift in monitoring focus, the partners need to know where recovery needs to happen and the measure of recovery.
- Scott suggested beginning abundance monitoring this field season on recovery properties in order to not have any longer lapse in the data string; and Dave agreed. Dave will forward this to the DNR. Scott also suggested that some recovery properties may have count data from the last two years that may not have been forwarded to the HCP data manager since none was required or assigned.

**Action:** Crystal and Dave can look into this. Crystal said that Sandhill submitted a large amount of past data, which may help fill the data gap from the last 2 years.

#### 5) Review results of 2005 Cause-Effect surveys, correct course as needed, and layout C-E survey assignments for 2006 field season.

- Crystal summarized that the objectives of the C-E surveys, which was to determine what the effect of HCP management activities have on Kbb habitat and KBB presence or absence. The goal was to get 20 surveys from each of the different types of management activities being studied. There are some problems with the current system, in some cases there aren't enough candidate sites submitted by partners to equal 20. Another recurrent problem has been with too little documentation defining where the survey was done, quarter/quarter documentation essential. Many of the surveys received this year were post-management; many were incomplete or filled out incorrectly. We need to improve instructions in 2006. Partners need to be more diligent about filling our pre-management surveys.
- Regarding SM surveys to find habitat (200 sites/year divided up proportionately by acres included). Some SM partners have indicated that they don't have any more places to look for lupine. What do we do about this type of monitoring? MIT proposed that partners who still have land to explore in search of lupine habitat should continue to survey at the same rate (avg. number of sites surveyed in previous years) that they have in the past. *Post-comment (Dave): The last two years specific sites were not assigned. SM partners were told the number of sites to survey, and then told to decide for themselves where to look where they thought it was most likely they would find lupine. Suggestion beginning in 2006 is to start by choosing sites in the recovery areas, then sites where they anticipate a management activity.*

**Action:** Crystal to look up the number of sites/year each SM partner was assigned. Quarry SM partners to see if they still have more possible places to look for lupine, or

they have sites in recovery areas that they have not investigated. Make 2006 assignments for this monitoring as indicated.

- Crystal reported that self-monitoring surveys also had issues that might need to be changed. One recurring item is the difficulty in determining if sites have been surveyed before since partners did not submit pre-management surveys in the past, and therefore sites did not get assigned a DNR code. A check box on a new form will help clarify this issue.

Matt asked if a numbering convention would be helpful in eliminating confusion with self-monitoring surveys (often they aren't referenced or are numbered with a system not consistent with the DNR system).

**Action: DNR to coordinate with property manager to determine site cross-referencing.**

Paul R.: Asked if there are any post-management surveys that are valid that can be used for analysis of lupine abundance.

Joel: At least some of these surveys would be useful for determining lupine abundance; most if not all of Plum Creek's would work.

**6) Decide the makeup of monitoring for the 2006 field season and develop instructions for partners.**

- Paul R.: For self monitoring surveys focus on areas where we can get enough information to draw conclusions; don't worry about the other groups. Pre/Post management data is collected as similar as possible so that conclusion can be drawn among and between data.
- Dave stated that we need to redevelop a survey form with a reference system, retrain partners to fill out forms correctly,

**Action: Crystal and Dave will work on 2006 monitoring instructions and assignments.**

Other things to consider are:

- Rethink level 1 surveying (old self-monitoring); not just for SM, but POH too; not just for long-time partners, but for new partners. Is there an expectation that everyone will do level 1 until all or most likely habitat areas have been explored and habitat identified? Why will it be important to know this outside of recovery areas?
- Remind partners that pre- and post-management surveys are still required within the high potential range on lands included in the HCP until the protocol is amended.

Share recommendations for 2006 monitoring with MIT for their comments and concurrence, and then share with IOC members for their concurrence. Issue 2006 monitoring instructions to partners by March 15<sup>th</sup>. Directly contact partners doing C-E studies.

NEXT MEETING: April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2006, 9:30 at Schmeckle

**Action: Joe to reserve Schmeckle or Portage County Annex for April 4<sup>th</sup> MIT meeting.**